

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
GREENVILLE DIVISION

C&T Manufacturing Company, Inc.,)	
)	C.A. No. 6:10-560-HMH
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	OPINION AND ORDER
)	
Hartford Fire Insurance Company,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

C&T Manufacturing Company (“C&T”) moves the court to compel Hartford Fire Insurance Company (“Hartford”) to provide a more detailed and complete answer to question number one of C&T’s second set of interrogatories pursuant to Rule 37 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. After review, the court grants C&T’s motion.

At issue is Hartford’s response to C&T’s interrogatory that Hartford “[p]rovide in detail how the Plaintiff has failed to comply with the terms of the policy.” (Pl. Reply 1.) Hartford responded:

Plaintiff failed to provide timely information as required by the Policy and as requested by the claim handler. The information required by the Policy is found in section “E.3. Duties in the Event of Loss or Damage.” The information requested by the claim handler is contained in the claim file, non-privileged portions of which will be produced.

(Id.) C&T argues that Hartford’s reference to the insurance policy is insufficient, and that it is entitled to an answer that describes with particularity how C&T failed to comply with the terms of the policy. The court agrees.

Interrogatories allow parties to narrow the issues and ascertain the facts relevant to the litigation. Miller v. Doctor's Gen. Hosp., 76 F.R.D. 136, 140 (W.D. Okl. 1977). "The answers to interrogatories must be responsive, full, complete and unevasive." Id. Hartford's response to interrogatory number one is nonresponsive and patently insufficient.

Therefore, it is

ORDERED that C&T's motion to compel, docket number 9, is granted.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Henry M. Herlong, Jr.
Senior United States District Judge

Greenville, South Carolina
September 23, 2010